



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

To imagine all this is not easy; yet some such dangers must lurk in British influences in South America, for otherwise how can one account for the action which our Government has taken?

Setting aside Venezuela as a genuine principal in the controversy, the United States has taken its place. It is *our* Government which has threatened war, has procured arbitration and arranged its terms, not that of Venezuela. What has become of the original party to the suit? Where does the United States find its mandate to act as guardian? What are the ultimate consequences likely to be? One cannot help putting one's self such questions as these. For such action by one state in behalf of another implies control, and control implies responsibility. We would discover the interest which governs our policy and the right which warrants our action.

This right is not derived from any treaty. We have had two treaties of amity and commerce with Venezuela, but both have been terminated by her, so that at present we have no treaty basis to govern the relations of the two countries. Nor is there anything in the geographical position of Venezuela which can explain any special interest in her affairs. It is a fair inference then that we have a similar duty, a similar interest and an equal right, in view of any similar dispute between a South American or still more a Central American state and a European power. Now whenever the United States stands thus as a guardian—sentinel is the word used in the Venezuelan Congress—to arrange its ward's disputes, this action will be regarded from a double point of view. The baffled European power will say that it implies a responsibility which we cannot shirk when the tables are turned and it is the injured party. If we cannot collect a bill by force as at Corinto, it will insist upon its payment through the State Department at Washington.

How can we claim enough control and responsibility to suit our hand at one time, and avoid too much at another? This will be a delicate diplomatic problem.

On the other hand, the American States though willing enough to accept our aid in extremities, must inevitably ask what reward we expect and what the limits of our right of interference are. As sovereign bodies they cannot surrender their initiative nor their responsibility in foreign relations. How will Chile and Brazil, Mexico and the Argentine regard our pretensions? They may not believe in national altruism.

We must expect these complications with both parties to every controversy, the one refusing to let us limit our responsibility as we may wish, the other fearing lest we gain too much power for its good. Too much responsibility and too little power; it is the problem which has puzzled the National Government when it admitted its responsibility for the conduct of an individual state like Louisiana, yet confessed its inability to control it.

The ultimate consequences of this new declaration of policy are likely to be far-reaching. One will be, perhaps we may say, has already been, to infuse the element of foreign complication into our domestic politics. We shall be no longer free to work out, untrammelled, the problems of Democratic Government. We have now on our hands serious questions of tariff and finance, of municipal reform, of honest, orderly and wise development. But henceforth, with foreign complications always possible, these questions can no longer be viewed with a single eye. The cost of a military and naval establishment and

of coast defence, commensurate with our pretensions, must affect them all.

And again, if we stand in the way of European Powers, wound their susceptibilities, interfere with their international liberty of action, their resentment may take the form of restrictions upon our exports of oil and pork and cattle and grain. This kind of reprisals has already proved troublesome, and the tendency is a growing one.

Then, also, if both parties should accept our right of intervention, the minor republics would tend to lose their sense of responsibility, and by their lack of it and the instability of their Governments, overburden us with the cares of headship. For headship it is, the headship of the American continent, that we are gradually assuming under the guise of an enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. Nothing new can be said about this Doctrine; its history and its theory have been related *ad nauseam*. But there is a simple reflection which should not be lost sight of, and that is this. No declaration of its policy, *i. e.*, of its intention and desires and belief, by a state, can possibly give it any rights over other states which it did not otherwise possess. If we are justified in enforcing the policy of President Monroe, it is only because that policy is in accord with the principles of International Law. On the other hand, when our policy is in violation of those principles, no claim on our part can legalize it. The Monroe Doctrine, as it is used and construed to-day, has become a mist before our eyes, hiding the real facts. Let us sweep it away and go back to fundamental principles. If anything takes place which really threatens our interests and our stability, we may intervene in self-defence. Intervention thus becomes a right but not necessarily advantageous. It may be *lawful* to do a thing, yet bad *policy* to do it. Thus in Venezuela our right to step in and defend her integrity if attacked is one thing; the policy of doing so, in view of various consequences which might follow, is quite another. We have inclined overmuch to argue that if the original Monroe Doctrine was lawful and right, any expansion of it would also be right if similarly labeled. And we have jumped at the conclusion that if we have the right of intervention, it is a duty also.—*The Independent*.

THE COMING OF PEACE.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D.

A CHRISTMAS MEDITATION.

Reprinted from the *Christian Register* of December 26, 1896.

Kant's famous essay on "Eternal Peace" was, in name at least, suggested by a satirical picture of a graveyard painted on the coat of arms of a Dutch innkeeper, and bearing the legend "To Eternal Peace." This droll combination of ideas in a cheap picture suggested a noble line of thought to the mind of the great philosopher, and so the grand essay came into existence one hundred years ago. It does not at first sight look as if the graveyard of international hatreds were as yet at all crowded, or were likely soon to be. Was Kant right? Or are hate and war to be eternal?

What was the state of things when the Christmas song of peace and goodwill was first sung? If one of the shepherds of Bethlehem, or one of the wise men from the East, had been asked what the angels meant by saying, "On earth peace, goodwill toward men," his brain would

have been much puzzled over the question. Some simple notion of peace of soul might have come to him, or of peace between a few individuals. The shepherds might have said that it meant the relief of Israel from his oppressors. But peace on earth, as we think of it!—how could this simple child be supposed to have any possible relation to such a thing! Was it conceivable that the awful tyranny of arms then everywhere enthroned could be thrown down? None of those who came about the infant Jesus could even have proposed to their minds such a problem. Peace on earth, goodwill to men! Was it merely a piece of angelic mockery from the skies?

The condition of the world at that time has often been called one of peace,—by what right I do not know. Milton has put the thought into his "Ode on the Nativity." But why was "no war nor battle sound heard the world around?" Why were the doors of the temple of Janus shut? Simply because one great, brutal power had its iron foot on the neck of all the rest. The sword was sheathed only because there were no more heads on which to use it. There were no more nations to subdue. All were down, at the feet of Rome. If you could have looked into the hearts of the peoples who had been robbed of their liberties, where anger and revenge forever blazed, you would have said that the condition was anything but peace, that the awful slaughters would soon enact themselves again. There can be no peace where love is dead, where justice and liberty are trampled under foot. It was a black, angry, hopeless sky in which the angels sang their song of peace and goodwill.

Christianity is the religion of peace, because it is the religion of love and justice. Even in Kant's time, only one hundred years ago, it seemed as if it had proved a failure in both these aspects. The world never seemed more out of joint. "Eternal Peace" was written in 1795, during the brief "Peace of Basle,"—the first lull in that frightful storm of communism, aggression, wrath and carnage which swept over Europe from 1789 to 1815. Kant's pen was scarcely dry when the storm burst again, with added fury. Eighteen hundred years had passed since Christianity first uttered its message of peace and goodwill. During this long period it had preached its principles of righteousness, love, benevolence and brotherhood in Western Asia, through all Europe, and for more than a hundred years in the New World. Every winter the Christmas story had been told; every spring that of the resurrection. In a way, this teaching had exercised an enormous influence, as every student of history knows. A number of evils it had driven out of European society,—gladiatorial shows, polygamy, slavery, private war. It had made multitudes of homes happy in the peace of God. It had in considerable measure created peace among individuals in their local relations, and even among groups of individuals near to each other or widely separated. But upon national walls of separation it had had no appreciable effect. Nations were still considered each other's natural enemies,—proper subjects for subjugation and humiliation. Only twice or three times before Kant had any one ventured to suggest the possibility of international peace. War between nations had been condemned as inhuman and unchristian by only a handful of Christians. By most, hatred of other nations was considered a Christian virtue, and war against them the most glorious of callings.

With the century which began with Kant's "Eternal

Peace," an entirely new order of events began, in both social and international relations,—the fruit, of course, of all the seed sown previously. The chief general characteristic of the hundred years now closing has been the ceaseless struggle of the new order to supplant the old. The old has maintained itself so vigorously that many still believe that no progress has been made toward the eradication of the spirit of hatred and war and the establishment of goodwill and peace. Many of the bloodiest wars known to history have been waged in this century. Nearly five millions of soldiers are now under arms. More than fifteen millions more have been trained, and are ready to fall upon each other at any moment. The nations of Europe spend annually two-thirds of their income in preparing for war and paying the interest on their war debts. These debts have accumulated with frightful rapidity during the last quarter of a century, until at present they aggregate nearly thirty thousand millions of dollars. Implements of war were never so numerous or so deadly as now. With their huge armies, their great fleets, their troublesome budgets, their hatreds and jealousies, the nations are constantly in a state of feverish dread and anxiety. Last winter, in Congress, a representative stood up in his place, and declared solemnly that, though eighteen Christian centuries have passed, yet no progress has been made toward the reign of peace and goodwill, using this argument to urge our country at once to militarize itself after the fashion of Europe.

Is militarism ultimately to overrun the world and kill out forever the spirit of love and goodwill? If there were not facts of another order, it would seem so; and the angels' song of peace might well grow silent. The new order of facts, indicating that the era of peace and goodwill, for men and nations, is not far away, may be thus briefly summarized:—

1. The sense of justice, the disposition to treat one's fellow-men in a way that is right and fair, has grown remarkably and become widely prevalent since the century began. This sentiment has manifested itself not only in individual acts of social righteousness, but also in improved laws and customs. Righteousness is the foundation of peace.

2. Equally marked has been the expansion of the spirit of benevolence. The disposition and purpose to do one's fellow-men good have prevailed in an entirely new way. A new and momentous fact has been the *permanent organization*, for world-wide service, of religious and philanthropic work. Into this channel now flow millions of money from millions of loving hands. Love in united service is the creator of peace.

3. Universal education, with its humanizing influences, had its origin in this same expanded spirit. Science has had a new birth, and has contributed greatly to the improvement of human life. Education and science are cosmopolitan. They know no race, or national boundary, or prejudice. They are the messengers of peace.

4. Liberty and free government have made great strides. Slavery and the slave trade have practically disappeared. Before Kant's time popular government had had hardly an experimental existence. Now all the nations of the Western World are independent republics. Two republics have become permanent in Europe. The other European nations, with one or two exceptions, have developed constitutional methods until they are essen-

tially governments of the people. Liberty is the handmaid of peace, and free governments will not long endure militarism.

5. Increased commerce and travel, growing out of the general spirit of the century, have brought peoples into contact, made them acquainted, removed prejudices, created common interests, modified laws, internationalized capital, opened world-wide opportunities for labor. Commerce and travel demand peace.

6. The Socialist labor movement, which originated in modern ideas of justice and fairness, and in the enlarged feeling of brotherhood, is, in its deeper, durable elements, a profound indication of the revulsion of modern thought and sentiment against the unreason and the brutalities of force and the selfishness which made these dominant. The union of labor the world over is one of the giants who are to pull down all the pillars of militarism. Labor hates war and loves peace.

7. The century has had nothing more expressive of its characteristic spirit of justice, fairness and tenderness than the new place which it has given to woman, in education, in benevolent activities, in freedom of service. Her advancement is accompanied by a corresponding decline in the supremacy of the law of might. She is the queen of peace, which is certain to follow in the footsteps of her elevation.

8. Our century has substituted law for the fist and the revolver, in the settlement of private disputes. The duel, which was in honor everywhere when the century opened, has been outlawed in all but one or two countries calling themselves civilized, and is on the point of outlawry in these.

9. The special philanthropy of peace has been permanently organized. Beginning in 1815, peace societies have been established, and grown in number and influence until their ideas and aims have taken hold of men of all classes, and made for themselves a permanent place in the press and in literature. Since the Paris Exposition, those societies have held an annual congress in different cities of the world. They have won the respect and co-operation of governments and statesmen. They have their special organs of propaganda, and have created for themselves a central International Bureau at Berne. They are now recognized as a permanent feature of modern humanitarian activity. They are powerfully aided in their work by that unique, eminently practical association in Europe known as the Interparliamentary Peace Union, having now a membership of more than twelve hundred statesmen, coming from every European Parliament. Special arbitration conferences, like that at Washington in April last, and the annual conference at Lake Mohonk, have greatly strengthened the movement.

10. The growing peace sentiment has also expressed itself in the numerous international arbitrations of the last hundred years. Before Kant's time there had been nothing really deserving such a name. Since then, there have been nearly a hundred important cases, involving every sort of serious international dispute, participated in at one time or another by nearly all the governments of the world. The year just closing, which began with serious international disturbance, has been remarkable for this class of settlements, or arrangements for settlement. Chief of these has been the Venezuela case, but there have been no less than six others touching the relations of ten different nations. No dispute now arises

between civilized nations without the question of arbitration being raised in connection with it. No fact could be more significant.

The movement for the permanent legislative recognition of the principle of arbitration has begun already to culminate. Cobden, at the instigation of the peace societies, started it in 1849. Henry Richard and Charles Sumner followed it up in the seventies. It has since made its way into many Parliaments. Several treaties have already been made between some of the smaller nations, agreeing to refer all questions in difference to arbitration. Switzerland has treaties of this kind with France, Ecuador and San Salvador. Spain and Honduras have one. Belgium has like treaties with Venezuela, the Orange Free State, and Hawaii. More significant still, the two great English-speaking nations, which have many years been discussing the subject, are, as the recent message of President Cleveland declares, just about to enter into a general treaty of this kind, creating at the same time a *court of arbitration as permanent as the treaty itself*.

The momentum of these great movements of our time has become at last irresistible. The old order of hate and violence must give way before the growing might of love and reason. Disarmament must soon take place by a process of natural decay, if it does not come amid the desolations of a social and international cataclysm which the tyranny of militarism is inviting. "War is on its last legs." Eternal peace is the early destiny of humanity. The angels' song of peace and goodwill this Christmas may well seem more than prophecy.

THE TERRIBLE EXIGENCIES OF WAR.

Another very sad case was that of "Poor Harry." I was walking from one hospital to another, when I saw a man digging what seemed to be a grave at the roadside.

I stopped and spoke to him as he worked with his pick, axe and shovel, and said, "It looks to me like a grave thou art digging." He replied, "I am digging a grave." "Well," I said, "that is an extraordinary place for a grave—why is it not in the cemetery or churchyard?"

To which he replied that the grave he was digging was for "a young man who was living and well."

From him and some ladies who gathered round me, I heard a part of the dismal history, which was afterwards corroborated, and completed the story of poor Harry, the only son of a widowed mother, far away in Minnesota.

His father had died in a fit of delirium tremens when he was a little infant. The mother had moved to a distant part of the country, where he was not known, and carefully shielded her little boy and girl from knowing how their father died, and from ever tasting the intoxicating draught. The boy had been all that a loving mother could wish till he grew up to be eighteen years of age, when the war broke out, and he enlisted in the army.

Thinking she was doing a brave and right act, the poor widow gave up her only son, to fight for his country; and taking leave of him at the railway station, as he went to join his regiment, her parting charge, as she placed her little Bible in his hand, was, "Harry, do not neglect your Bible, do not neglect prayer, do not forget your Saviour, and remember your promise to your mother—you have promised me that you will never drink."